

1  
2  
3  
4 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
5 DISTRICT OF NEVADA

6 \* \* \*

7 TASHAMI SIMS,

8 Plaintiff,

9 v.

10 ARAMARK INC., et. al.,

11 Defendants.

Case No. 2:19-cv-00016-RFB-EJY

**ORDER**

12  
13 This action began with a *pro se* civil rights complaint filed pursuant to 42 U.S.C. §  
14 1983 by a former detainee at the Clark County Detention Center. On July 10, 2019, this  
15 Court issued an order directing Plaintiff to file his updated address with this Court within  
16 thirty (30) days. (ECF No. 7.) The thirty-day period has now expired, and Plaintiff has  
17 not filed his updated address or otherwise responded to the Court's order.

18 District courts have the inherent power to control their dockets and “[i]n the  
19 exercise of that power, they may impose sanctions including, where appropriate . . .  
20 dismissal” of a case. Thompson v. Hous. Auth. of City of Los Angeles, 782 F.2d 829, 831  
21 (9th Cir. 1986). A court may dismiss an action, with prejudice, based on a party's failure  
22 to prosecute an action, failure to obey a court order, or failure to comply with local rules.  
23 See Ghazali v. Moran, 46 F.3d 52, 53-54 (9th Cir. 1995) (dismissal for noncompliance  
24 with local rule); Ferdik v. Bonzelet, 963 F.2d 1258, 1260-61 (9th Cir. 1992) (dismissal  
25 for failure to comply with an order requiring amendment of complaint); Carey v. King, 856  
26 F.2d 1439, 1440-41 (9th Cir. 1988) (dismissal for failure to comply with local rule requiring  
27 *pro se* plaintiffs to keep court apprised of address); Malone v. U.S. Postal Service, 833  
28 F.2d 128, 130 (9th Cir. 1987) (dismissal for failure to comply with court order); Henderson  
///

1 v. Duncan, 779 F.2d 1421, 1424 (9th Cir. 1986) (dismissal for lack of prosecution and  
2 failure to comply with local rules).

3 In determining whether to dismiss an action for lack of prosecution, failure to obey  
4 a court order, or failure to comply with local rules, the Court must consider several factors:  
5 (1) the public's interest in expeditious resolution of litigation; (2) the court's need to  
6 manage its docket; (3) the risk of prejudice to the defendants; (4) the public policy favoring  
7 disposition of cases on their merits; and (5) the availability of less drastic alternatives.  
8 Thompson, 782 F.2d at 831; Henderson, 779 F.2d at 1423-24; Malone, 833 F.2d at 130;  
9 Ferdik, 963 F.2d at 1260-61; Ghazali, 46 F.3d at 53.

10 In the instant case, the Court finds that the first two factors, the public's interest in  
11 expeditiously resolving this litigation and the Court's interest in managing the docket,  
12 weigh in favor of dismissal. The third factor, risk of prejudice to Defendants, also weighs  
13 in favor of dismissal, since a presumption of injury arises from the occurrence of  
14 unreasonable delay in filing a pleading ordered by the court or prosecuting an action. See  
15 Anderson v. Air West, 542 F.2d 522, 524 (9th Cir. 1976). The fourth factor – public policy  
16 favoring disposition of cases on their merits – is greatly outweighed by the factors in favor  
17 of dismissal discussed herein. Finally, a court's warning to a party that his failure to obey  
18 the court's order will result in dismissal satisfies the "consideration of alternatives"  
19 requirement. Ferdik, 963 F.2d at 1262; Malone, 833 F.2d at 132-33; Henderson, 779  
20 F.2d at 1424. The Court's order requiring Plaintiff to file his updated address with the  
21 Court within thirty (30) days expressly stated: "It is further ordered that, if Plaintiff fails to  
22 timely comply with this order, the Court shall dismiss this case without prejudice." (ECF  
23 No. 7 at 2.) Thus, Plaintiff had adequate warning that dismissal would result from his  
noncompliance with the Court's order to file his updated address within thirty (30) days.

24 **IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED** that this action is dismissed without prejudice  
25 based on Plaintiff's failure to file an updated address in compliance with this Court's July  
26 10, 2019 order.

27 **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that the application to proceed *in forma pauperis* (ECF  
28 No. 6) is denied as moot.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

**IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that the Clerk of Court shall enter judgment accordingly.

DATED this 4th day of October, 2019.



---

**RICHARD F. BOULWARE, II**  
**UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE**